



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/829,225	04/09/2001	Antonio R. Bogat	8594	8621

26890 7590 02/17/2005

JAMES M. STOVER
NCR CORPORATION
1700 SOUTH PATTERSON BLVD, WHQ4
DAYTON, OH 45479

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 02/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/829,225

Applicant(s)

BOGAT, ANTONIO R.

Examiner

CESAR B. PAULA

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 September 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment, and updated oath filed on 9/7/2004.

This action is made Final.

2. In the amendment, claims 14-18 have been added. Claims 1-18 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 5, 10, and 13 are independent claims.

3. The rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Doyle, has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Oath/Declaration

4. The oath/declaration have been amended to clarify the citizenship. Therefore, the objection has been withdrawn.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 4/9/2001 has been entered, and considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2178

7. Appropriate corrections have been made to claims 3, 8-9, and 13. Therefore, the rejections of these claims have been withdrawn.

8. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

9. Claim 18 recites the limitation "the first and second information" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. There is no previous "first information" found in this claim or its base independent claim (13).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 1-2, 5-6, and 8-11 remain, and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lemay et al, "Web Workshop JavaScript", hereinafter Javascript, Sams.net, 1996, pages 178-179, 186-191.

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding independent claim 1, Javascript discloses the prompting, and storing of a user's name in a cookie in order to remember the user when the user—*first visitor--* comes back to a web page —*web site* (page 187-189, fig. 9.6). The user's name serves to identify the user to the web site, whenever the user visits the site.

In addition, Javascript discloses that a user can store cookies having preferences, such as a user's name. Whenever the user comes back to the web page, this user is remembered, and if a name has been previously stored in the cookie, a javascript is used—*performing first background search on the first visitor--* to greet the user by displaying the user's name on the web page (page 187-189, fig. 9.6). The name is retrieved from the javascript and displayed on a web browser—*selecting first information from a collection of information* reflecting the user's stored preferences.

Furthermore, Javascript teaches a server sending and outputting a web page, containing the user's name, to a user—*transmitting the first information to the first visitor* (page 179, lines 1-12, page 187, lines 1-8, pages 188-189, fig. 9.6).

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Javascript discloses the prompting, and storing of a user's name in a cookie in order to remember each user that accesses a web page, when the user—*second visitor--* comes back to a web page —*web site* (page 179, 187-189, fig. 9.6). The user's name serves to identify the user(s) to the web site, whenever the site is visited by the user(s).

In addition, Javascript discloses that a user(s) can store cookies storing preferences, such as a user's name. Whenever the user comes back to the web page, this user is remembered, and if

Art Unit: 2178

a name has been previously stored, a javascript is used—*performing second background search on the second visitor*-- to greet the user by displaying the user's name on the web page (page 187-189, fig. 9.6). The name is retrieved from the javascript and displayed on a web browser—*selecting from the collection of information second information* reflecting each user's stored preferences. In other words, a user's name is displayed, whenever each user visits a web page or site to be able to track or tell different users.

Furthermore, Javascript teaches a server sending or outputting a web page, containing the user's name, to each user—*transmitting the first information to the second visitor* (page 179, lines 1-12, page 187, lines 1-8, pages 188-189, fig. 9.6).

Regarding independent claim 5, Javascript discloses a user viewing a web page in accordance to users' predetermined preferences, whenever each user returns to the web page, using links such as targeted links—*an inquiry by a user to the web site* (page 178-179, 187-189).

Furthermore, Javascript discloses that a user(s) can store cookies having preferences. Whenever the user comes back to the web page, this user is remembered, and the web page is viewed based upon the user's preferences (page 179, and 187). In other words, whenever a user returns to a web page or site, a server determines if there is a cookie associated with the user. If there is a cookie with preferences stored in association with the user, then the web page (containing information such as frames—*first and second information*) is sent and displayed to a user, in accordance to the user's preferences —*estimating whether the user possesses selected characteristics or preferences and based on the estimate selecting first and second information from a collection of information*.

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 1, Javascript discloses that a user(s) can store cookies having preferences. Whenever the user comes back to the web page, this user is remembered, and the web page is sent to the user and viewed based upon the user's preferences (page 179, and 187).

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 5, Javascript discloses the prompting, and storing of a user's name—*specific identity of the visitor*-- in a cookie in order to remember each user that accesses a web page, when the user comes back to a web page (page 179, 187-189, fig. 9.6). The user's name serves to identify the user(s) to the web site, whenever the site is visited by the user(s).

Regarding claim 9, which depends on claim 8, Javascript discloses the display of a web page using a cookie, which only contains the user's name as a preference—*no characteristics in addition to the specific identity of the individual*--- whenever the user comes back to a web page (page 187-189, fig. 9.6).

Regarding independent claim 10, Javascript discloses a user viewing a web page in accordance to users' predetermined preferences, whenever each user returns to the web page, using links such as targeted links—*receiving an inquiry by a user to the web site* (page 178-179, 187-189).

Art Unit: 2178

Furthermore, Javascript discloses that a user(s) can store cookies having preferences. Whenever the user comes back to the web page, this user is remembered—*ascertaining identity of the visitor* using the cookie-- and the web page is viewed based upon the user's preferences—*visitor-specific information* (page 178-179, and 187). In other words, whenever a user returns to a web page or site, a server determines if there is a cookie associated with the user. If there is a cookie with preferences stored in association with the user, then the web page (containing information such as frames—*response information*) is sent and displayed to a user, in accordance to the user's preferences.

Claim 11 is directed towards a method for implementing the steps found in claim 6, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 14, which depends on claim 1, Javascript, teaches sending a web page, having multiple frames—*first information made visible to the first visitor*, to be displayed to the user based on user's preferences (page 179, and 187).

Regarding claim 15, which depends on claim 2, Javascript, teaches sending a web page, having multiple frames—*second information made visible to the second visitor*, to be displayed to the user based on user's preferences (page 179, and 187). In other words, when another user accesses the web site from his computer, the web page with multiple frames of information is presented according to that user's preferences.

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 16, which depends on claim 5, Javascript, teaches sending a web page, having multiple frames—*first and second information made visible to the visitor*, to be displayed to the user based on user's preferences (page 179, and 187).

Regarding claim 17, which depends on claim 10, Javascript discloses that a user(s) can store cookies having preferences. Whenever the user comes back to the web page, this user is remembered—*ascertaining identity of the visitor* using the cookie-- and the web page is viewed based upon the user's preferences (page 178-179, and 187, fig.9.6). In other words, whenever a user returns to a web page or site, a server determines if there is a cookie associated with the user. If there is a cookie with preferences stored in association with the user, then the web page containing the user's name (containing information such as frames—*response information, and visitor-specific information*) is sent and displayed to a user, in accordance to the user's preferences.

12. Claims 13, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nehab et al, hereinafter Nehab (Pat. # 6,029,182, 2/22/2000).

Regarding independent claim 13, Nehab discloses accepting a user command to browse or traverse a hypermedia link—*receiving an inquiry from a visitor to the web site* (col.8, lines 35-39).

Moreover, Nehab discloses the creation of a rule for later duplicating the selections made by the user's commands, such as specifying that newspaper articles under certain heading should

Art Unit: 2178

be retrieved (col.8, lines 38-67). In other words, the web page is constructed based on what the web site thinks the user might like, by looking at the command used by the user to retrieve a web page—*making an estimate of selected characteristics of the visitor*.

Moreover, Nehab discloses the prompting a user to set an automatic newspaper delivery time for sending the newspaper to the user. A web retrieval system is launched automatically at the time designated by the user, and retrieval of articles based on a personal profile from appropriate web sites. The profile contains both the created rule-- *the estimate*-- and user-specified preferences (col.10, lines 21-36)—*asking the visitor whether customer-specific information is desired and if so, deriving customer-specific information from a collection of information based on the estimate, based on the inquiry, selecting second information from the collection*.

Furthermore, Nehab discloses the formatting of the retrieved information (both rule, and user preferences based) into a personalized newspaper over the Internet, sending and storing it for later viewing in the user's computer (col.10, lines 30-44, col.11, lines 60-col.12, line 37, fig.6)—*compiling the customer-specific information and the second information into a message, and transmitting the message to the visitor*.

Regarding claim 18, which depends on claim 13, Nehab discloses the formatting of the retrieved information articles —*first and second information made visible to the visitor*—

(both rule, and user preferences based) into a personalized newspaper over the Internet, sending and storing it for later viewing in the user's computer (col.10, lines 30-44, col.11, lines 60-col.12, line 37, fig.6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Javascript, in view of Nehab et al, hereinafter Nehab (Pat. # 6,029,182, 2/22/2000).

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 1, Javascript discloses that a user(s) can store cookies having preferences. Whenever the user comes back to the web page, this user is remembered, and the web page is sent to the user and viewed based upon the user's preferences (page 179, and 187). Javascript fails to explicitly disclose: *the first background research comprises contacting another website*. Nehab teaches a learning mode for creating a log of several web sites visited by a user in order to duplicate the user's navigation preference (col.8, lines 33-67). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Javascript, and Nehab, because Nehab teaches allowing a user the benefit of scanning personalized data and read this data, which is relevant to the user's preferences, and which doesn't include too much information, in a natural fashion (col. 2, lines 1-10, 40-67), thereby preventing overwhelming a second user with voluminous, and irrelevant information.

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 2, Javascript discloses that a user(s) can store cookies having preferences. Whenever the user comes back to the web page, this user is remembered, and the web page is sent to the user and viewed based upon the user's preferences (page 179, and 187). Javascript fails to explicitly disclose: *the second background research comprises contacting the other website*. Nehab teaches a learning mode for creating a log of several web sites visited-- *second background research*-- by a user(s) in order to duplicate the user's navigation preference (col.8, lines 33-67). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Javascript, and Nehab, because Nehab teaches allowing people—*first, second, third visitors..*-- the benefit of scanning personalized data and read this data, which is relevant to the user's preferences, and which doesn't include too much information, in a natural fashion (col. 2, lines 1-10, 40-67), thereby preventing overwhelming a second user with voluminous, and irrelevant information.

15. Claims 7, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Javascript, in view of Landan (Pat. # 6,449,739 B1, 9/10/2002, filed on 1/17/2000).

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 1, Javascript discloses that a user(s) can store cookies having preferences. Whenever the user comes back to the web page, this user is remembered, and the web page is sent to the user and viewed based upon the user's preferences (page 179, and 187). Javascript fails to explicitly disclose: *the message comprises an electronic mail message*. Landan teaches disseminating customized web reports via email (col.8, lines 50-

Art Unit: 2178

54). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Javascript, and Landan, because Landan teaches the prompt notification of system administrators when a problem occurs in a web site (col. 2, lines 1-24-50, col.3, lines 27-67), thereby allowing system administrators a mechanism to quickly respond to web site problems.

Claim 12 is directed towards a method for implementing the steps found in claim 7, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant's arguments filed 9/7/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding claim 1, the Applicant indicates that the selection of first information is not done based on the background research (page 5, line 23-page 6, line 3). The Examiner disagrees, because Javascript discloses retrieving information, such as a user's name, from a cookie (pages 187-189, fig.9.6). In other words, the computer is searching the cookie, behind the scenes,--background research-- to retrieve the needed information

Moreover, Applicant indicates that claim limitations a) and b) are not needed for locating the cookie (page 6, lines 16-19). It is unclear what this statement means. However, Javascript teaches the prompting, and storing of a user's name in a cookie in order to remember the user when the user--first visitor-- comes back to a web page --web site (page 187-189, fig. 9.6). The user's name serves to identify the user to the web site, whenever the user visits the site.

Art Unit: 2178

In addition, Javascript discloses that a user can store cookies having preferences, such as a user's name. Whenever the user comes back to the web page, this user is remembered, and if a name has been previously stored in the cookie, a javascript is used—*performing first background search on the first visitor*-- to greet the user by displaying the user's name on the web page (page 187-189, fig. 9.6). The name is retrieved from the javascript and displayed on a web browser—*selecting first information from a collection of information* reflecting the user's stored preferences.

Moreover, Applicant indicates that a cookie does not actually identify a visitor to a web, because if another person, other than the user, is using the computer to visit the website, and the name of the first user is used to greet the second person, then this would not be equivalent to identifying the first user (page 7, lines 1-8, 16-22). This is not the scenario presented by Javascript, because Javascript assumes that the user that is listed in the cookie, is the same person using the computer at the time the user is greeted with the name retrieved from the cookie (page 187, lines 1-8).

Moreover, Applicant presents couple of hypothetical scenarios that try to explain why a cookie does not actually identify a visitor to a web (page 8, lines 12-page 9, line 14). In a first scenario, the user is browsing the web site using a different computer operating system, and in the second scenario, the same user is visiting the web site using a different computer at another location, such as a library. Applicant argues that in these cases, the user is not identified (page 7, lines 1-8, 16-22). However, these scenarios are not presented by Javascript. Javascript teaches a scenario where the user that is listed in the cookie, is the same person using the computer at the time the user is greeted with the name retrieved from the cookie (page 187, lines 1-8).

Art Unit: 2178

Moreover, Applicant asserts that limitations b-c are being taught by the same element of Javascript—the identification of the user, and performing the background research (page 10, lines 2-7). This is not the case, because as shown by the rejection (page 4, lines 1-4), Javascript identifies the user when the user registers the name and personal information into the cookie. The background or behind-the-scenes research takes place when the user gets back to the web site.

In addition, Applicant notes that performing the background research cannot refer to looking up a name in a cookie (page 10, line 16-page 11, line 12). This is not the case, because as shown by the rejection (page 4, lines 1-4), Javascript first identifies the user when the user registers the name and personal information into the cookie. The background or behind-the-scenes research takes place when the user gets back to the web site by searching for the cookie associated with the user.

Regarding claim 2, Applicant argues that treating cookies for both the first and second visitor, is not reasonable, because the cookies are stored in different computers (page 12, lines 6-page 13, line 5). The Examiner disagrees, because as it is taught by Javascript, a server serves the cookies to each user's browser; the cookies are transmitted from the server to the individual users (page 179, lines 4-7).

Regarding claim 5, Applicant argues that limitation e) is not taught by Javascript, namely the first and second information (page 12, lines 6-page 13, line 5). The Examiner disagrees, because Javascript, teaches sending a web page, having multiple frames—*first and second*

Art Unit: 2178

information, to a user based on user's preferences (page 179, and 187). In this case, the frames, and the information within these frames comprise the first and second information.

Regarding claim 6, Applicant argues that since the message of claim 5 is not taught, then the web page included in the message, as recited in this claim, is also not taught (page 15, lines 8-11). The Examiner disagrees, because Javascript, teaches sending a web page, having multiple frames—*first and second information*, to a user based on user's preferences (page 179, and 187). In this case, the frames, and the information within these frames comprise the first and second information.

Claim 8 is rejected at least based on the rationale stated above concerning claim 5.

Regarding claim 9, Applicant indicates that the rejection of this claim seems contradictory, because in claim 5 user preferences are equivalent to the "characteristics", and in this claim the preferences are not present (page 16, lines 5-8). The Examiner disagrees, because this claim recites having no other characteristic besides the identity of the individual, which is taught by Javascript's greeting the user by name as an only characteristic or preference in a web page (page 187-189).

Regarding claim 10, Applicant indicates that the rejection of the visitor-specific information makes little sense (page 17). The Examiner disagrees, because Javascript teaches viewing a web page based upon the preferences -- *visitor-specific information* -- of a user visiting

Art Unit: 2178

a web site (page 178-179, 187). Applicant seems to be reading into the claims more than is recited. The examples used seem to point to the invention as disclosed in the specification, not the claim. As indicated above, Javascript teaches the limitations of the claim, which are stated broadly.

Regarding claim 11, Applicant argues that the rejection of this claim is contradictory, because the message contains the web page (page 19, lines 1-16). The Examiner disagrees, because Javascript, teaches sending a web page, having multiple frames—*response information*, to a user based on user's preferences (page 179, and 187). In this case, the message is the web page transmitted to the user as a result of the user's request for the web page.

Regarding claim 3, Applicant argues how can a cookie look-up be found in Nehab's direct route to a sport page (page 20, lines 1-11). It is unclear what's meant by this statement. However, Nehab discloses a learning mode for logging or keeping track of user's navigation preferences —*first background research comprises contacting another web site--*, so as to personalize a newspaper (col.8, lines 33-67). So in the case where the background research comprises contacting another web site, Nehab's teaching comprises the contacting of another web site by the user in order to log or perform the behind the scenes research.

Moreover, Applicant argues that the rejection fails to state what is obtained from the combination of Nehab, and Javascript (page 22, lines 2-13). The Examiner disagrees, because Javascript, fails to teach the contacting another web site in the implementation of the background

Art Unit: 2178

research. However, Nehab teaches that the accessing of other web sites by the user causes the logging or tracking of the user's preferences (col.8, lines 33-67).

Regarding claim 4, Applicant states that the same web site is contacted for both background researches (page 22, lines 15-122). The Examiner disagrees, because the research performed in claim 1 is different from the one performed in claim 4.

Regarding claim 7, Applicant argues that the motivation to combine Javascript and Landan has no logical connection with Landan's email reports (page 20, lines -11). The Examiner disagrees, because Landan sends a web page report to a user via email (col.8, lines 50-54). In other words, personalized information thought to be needed by the user, is transmitted as a web page report via email, which would aid in gathering personalized information as it is Nehab's goal.

Regarding claim 13, Applicant notes that limitation c) is not present in the rejection (page 20, lines -11). The Examiner disagrees, because the rejection states (page 10, lines 10-13) that the user is asked whether or not the user wishes to go to his pre-stored list of favorite items—*asking the visitor whether customer-specific information is desired*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined derived the information, and compiled the first and second information into a message, because Doyle teaches above allowing the user the option of retrieving the list of favorite items on a web site, providing the benefit of displaying a web page, which contains a list of personalized items

Art Unit: 2178

desired by the user, thereby preventing a waste of time needed to sort through the web site to get to the information that is of interest to the user.

The Applicant is directed to the new rejections of newly added claims 14-18.

Conclusion

I. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- (703) 703-872-9306, (for all Formal communications intended for entry)


CESAR B PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER
AU 2178

2/16/05